

## PROJECT: 23-1036 REST, ASOTIN IMW LOW TECH DESIGN AND RESTORATION

Sponsor: Trout Unlimited Inc. Program: Salmon State Projects Status: Application Submitted

## Parties to the Agreement

## PRIMARY SPONSOR

Trout Unlimited Inc.

Address 1777 N Kent Street, Suite 100

City Arlington State VA Zip 22201

Org Type Non-Gov-Nonprofit

Vendor # SWV0050369-00

UBI 601215617

Date Org created

Org Notes

[link to Organization profile](#)☐ Org data updated

## QUESTIONS - PRIMARY SPONSOR

#1: What date was your organization created?

1959

#2: Is your organization registered as a non-profit with the Washington Secretary of State?

Yes

#2a: Please confirm the Unified Business Identifier (UBI) shown above is correct or provide if blank.

602 988 374

#3: How long has your organization been involved in salmon and habitat conservation?

&gt;20 years

#4: Do your organizational documents (charter, bylaws, or articles of incorporation) include the authority for the protection or enhancement of natural resources or related activities?

Yes

Yes, Trout Unlimited's mission is to conserve, protect, and restore North America's coldwater fisheries and their watersheds.

#5: Do your organizational documents (charter, bylaws, or articles of incorporation) provide for an equivalent successor organization in case the nonprofit dissolves?

Yes

Yes, Trout Unlimited's Bylaws state: Upon the dissolution of the Corporation or the winding up of its affairs, the assets of the Corporation remaining after payment, or provision for payment, of all debts and liabilities shall be distributed exclusively to one or more charitable, religious, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational organizations

## SECONDARY SPONSORS

No records to display

## MANAGING AGENCY

Recreation and Conservation Office

## LEAD ENTITY

Snake River Salmon Rec Bd LE

## QUESTIONS

# Project Application Report - 23-1036

#1: List project partners and their role and contribution to the project.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife will potentially participate in coordination and help with permitting.

## External Systems

### SPONSOR ASSIGNED INFO

Sponsor-Assigned Project Number

Sponsor-Assigned Regions

### EXTERNAL SYSTEM REFERENCE

Source	Project Number	Submitter
HWS	23-1036	AFitzgerald

## Project Contacts

Contact Name Primary Org	Project Role	Work Phone	Work Email
<a href="#">Kendall Barrameda</a> Rec. and Conserv. Office	Project Manager	(360) 764-9086	<a href="mailto:Kendall.Barrameda@rco.wa.gov">Kendall.Barrameda@rco.wa.gov</a>
<a href="#">Aaron Penvose</a> Trout Unlimited Inc.	Project Contact	(509) 888-0970	<a href="mailto:apenvose@tu.org">apenvose@tu.org</a>
<a href="#">Ali Fitzgerald</a> Snake River Salmon Rec Bd LE	Lead Entity Contact	(509) 382-4115	<a href="mailto:ali@snakeriverboard.org">ali@snakeriverboard.org</a>
<a href="#">Stephen Bennett</a> Eco Logical Research Inc.	Consultant	(435) 757-5668	<a href="mailto:bennett.ecological@gmail.com">bennett.ecological@gmail.com</a>

## Worksites & Properties

# Worksite Name

#1 Asotin IMW

Restoration	Property Name
✓	Asotin Wildlife Management Area 1

## Worksite Map & Description

### Worksite #1: Asotin IMW

#### WORKSITE ADDRESS

Street Address

City, State, Zip

## Worksite Details

### Worksite #1: Asotin IMW

#### SITE ACCESS DIRECTIONS

From Clarkston, WA head east on Highway 129 and turn left onto Asotin Creek Road just before entering the town of Asotin, WA. Drive approximately 12 miles up Asotin Creek Road. Charley Creek enters Asotin Creek at approximately river mile 13.8, Drive approximately 14.5 miles up Asotin Creek Road and North Fork and South Fork Asotin Creek begin at the confluence their confluence just upstream from the bridge crossing known as the "Forks".

#### TARGETED ESU SPECIES

Species by ESU	Egg Present	Juvenile Present	Adult Present	Population Trend
Chinook-Snake River Spring/Summer, Asotin Creek, Threatened	✓	✓	✓	Unknown
Steelhead-Snake River, Asotin Creek, Threatened	✓	✓	✓	Unknown

#### Reference or source used

Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan and Northwest Marine Fisheries Service. 2017. ESA Recovery Plan for Snake River Spring/Summer Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) & Snake River Basin Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Portland OR.

#### TARGETED NON-ESU SPECIES

Species by Non-ESU	Notes
Bull Trout	
Lamprey	

#### Questions

#1: Give street address or road name and mile post for this worksite if available.

na

# Project Application Report - 23-1036

## Project Location

### RELATED PROJECTS

#### Projects in PRISM

PRISM Number	Project Name	Program Name	Current Status	Relationship Type	Notes
22-1953 C	Asotin IMW Monitoring PSMFC 2023	Pacific States Projects	Active	Current Phase	

#### Related Project Notes

The Project is located within the Asotin Creek Intensively Monitored Watershed study area which is located within the Asotin Creek Watershed and specifically within the Asotin Wildlife Management Area. The actions will focus on the lower 8 km (~5 miles) of Charley Creek, North Fork and South Fork Asotin Creeks. All of project area in Charley Creek and North Fork Asotin Creek are within the Snake River Summer Steelhead MSA and priority restoration reaches as is the lower 1.5 miles of the South Fork Asotin project area.

### Questions

#1: Project location. Describe the geographic location, water bodies, and the location of the project in the watershed, i.e. nearshore, tributary, main-stem, off-channel, etc.

Project is located on the mainstem of three tributaries to Asotin Creek in southeast Washington; Charley Creek, North Fork Asotin Creek, and South Fork Asotin Creek, starting near the mouth of each creek and continuing upstream approximately 5 miles.

#2: How does this project fit within your regional recovery plan and/or local lead entity's strategy to restore or protect salmonid habitat? Cite section and page number.

This project fits into the Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan for SE Washington's (SRSRB 2011) approach to habitat restoration (Chapter 6.3.2, p. 193-196).

Charley Creek, North Fork Asotin Creek, and South Fork Asotin Creek are within the Asotin Creek watershed, a major spawning area (MSA) for ESA-listed Snake River steelhead and Chinook.

#3: Is this project part of a larger overall project?

Yes

#3a: How does this project fit into the sequencing of the larger project?

We have been working on Charley Creek, North Fork and South Fork Asotin Creek for over a decade to restore stream processes and improve spawning and rearing habitat for Snake River steelhead and Chinook by increasing in-stream habitat complexity, floodplain connectivity, and riparian function.

#4: Is the project on State Owned Aquatic Lands? Please contact the Washington State Department of Natural Resources to make a determination. [Aquatic Districts and Managers](#)

No

# Project Application Report - 23-1036

## Property Details

Property: Asotin Wildlife Management Area 1 (Worksite #1: Asotin IMW)

✓ Restoration

### LANDOWNER

Name Washington Department of Fish and Wild  
Address 2315 N. Discovery Place  
City Spokane Valley  
State WA Zip 99216  
Type State

### CONTROL & TENURE

Instrument Type Landowner Agreement  
Timing Proposed  
Term Length Fixed # of years  
# Yrs 10  
Expiration Date 09/30/2033  
Note

## Project Proposal

### Project Description

Trout Unlimited is sponsoring a design and restoration project utilizing lessons learned from the Asotin Creek IMW to implement further restoration actions to restore stream processes and improve spawning and rearing habitat for Snake River steelhead and Chinook. These actions will increase in-stream habitat complexity, floodplain connectivity, and riparian function within the Asotin Creek MSA targeting priority restoration reaches on Charley Creek, North Fork, and South Fork Asotin creeks. All work will be done within WDFW property in the Asotin Wildlife Management Area. In phase 1, we will use existing LiDAR to identify key confining features (e.g., old berms) for design and removal. Confining features will be prioritized by extent of unconfined habitat potential and removal will be done using a mini excavator with minimal intervention to keep within the "let the system do the work approach" of the IMW. Phase 2 includes maintenance on existing restoration sections, and the design and installation of low-tech process-based structures (e.g., PALS and BDAs) within the upper 2.5 miles of unrestored sections in Charley Creek and the North Fork and the lower 1.25 miles in the South Fork. Total anticipated restoration footprint would be 6-8 miles over 3 years.

### Project Questions

#1: Problem statement. What are the problems your project seeks to address? Include the source and scale of each problem. Describe the site, reach, and watershed conditions. Describe how those conditions impact salmon populations. Include current and historic factors important to understand the problems.

The Asotin Creek watershed supports populations of steelhead, Chinook, lamprey, and bull trout that are limited by degraded spawning and rearing habitat conditions due to historic removal of instream and riparian wood and trees, trapping of beaver, successive large floods, and straightening of channels. Structural starvation and poor floodplain connectivity are the key limiting factors this project seeks to address as it limits instream complexity, frequency of overbank flow, and extent and function of active floodplain and riparian area, which limits production and productivity for the impacted populations.

#2: Describe the limiting factors, and/or ecological concerns, and limiting life stages (by fish species) that your project expects to address.

Limiting factors in the watershed are structural starvation, poor floodplain connectivity, lack of habitat quantity and quality (SRSRB 2011). Lack of habitat diversity impacts all life stages of steelhead and Chinook. This project would address these limiting factors by providing added structure and habitat complexity with the implementation of PALs and BDAs, and increasing habitat quantity by increasing floodplain connectivity by the removal of confining features. These actions would improve sediment sorting, increase habitat complexity with increased pool and bar frequency, and increase floodplain connectivity that will provide additional cover for adult holding, juvenile rearing, and improve spawning habitat.

## Project Application Report - 23-1036

#3: What are the project goals? The goal of the project should be to solve identified problems by addressing the root causes. Then clearly state the desired future condition. Include which species and life stages will benefit from the outcome, and the time of year the benefits will be realized. [Example Goals and Objectives](#)

The overall goals are to take lessons learned from the Asotin IMW and further promote self-sustaining, natural stream processes that improve spawning and rearing habitat for Snake River steelhead and Chinook through the strategic and opportunistic removal of berms blocking off potential side channel and floodplain habitat, and installation of PALs and BDAs.

#4: What are the project objectives? Objectives support and refine biological goals, breaking them down into smaller steps. Objectives are specific, quantifiable actions the project will complete to achieve the stated goal. Each objective should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound). [Example Goals and Objectives](#)

1. Identify confining berms for potential opening and floodplain connection in Charley Creek, South Fork Asotin Creek, and North Fork Asotin Creek
2. Rank the berms based on maximizing side-channel and floodplain connection
3. Use a mini-excavator or other suitable machine to open holes in 20-30 key confining berms (not complete removal)
4. Reconnect 10-15 acres of new floodplain and 2.0-3.0 miles of side-channels through confining berm removal
5. Install a combination of 175-250 post-assisted log structures (PALS), 175-250 whole trees, and 20-30 beaver dam analogues (BDAs) in three sections of the IMW (section 3 of Charley Creek (2.5 miles), and section 2 of North Fork (2.5 miles), and the lower 1.25 mi of section 1 of the South Fork, totaling 6 miles of treatment (see Appendix C in Basis of Design Report for locations)
6. Promote pool formation, sediment sorting, increased geomorphic complexity, as well as creating or enhancing 100-125 new pools (increase pool frequency > 20 per stream mile) in the 6 miles of total proposed treatment area within Charley Creek, South Fork Asotin Creek, and North Fork Asotin Creek

#5: Scope of work and deliverables. Provide a detailed description of each project task/element. With each task/element, identify who will be responsible for each, what the deliverables will be, and the schedule for completion.

1. LiDAR and field review of confining features - March 2024
2. Removal Planning, Design and Permitting - March 2024
3. Removal of confining features - December 2025
4. LTPBR planning, design, permitting - June 2024
5. Implementation wood addition Charley Creek, North Fork and South Fork Asotin Creek Dec 2025

## Project Application Report - 23-1036

#6: What are the assumptions and physical constraints that could impact whether you achieve your objectives?

Assumptions and constraints are external conditions that are not under the direct control of the project, but directly impact the outcome of the project. These may include ecological and geomorphic factors, land use constraints, public acceptance of the project, delays, or other factors. How will you address these issues if they arise?

Most restoration structures will be secured with posts so the assumption is that a majority of them will not move. Some structures or parts of structures may be lost during high flows. Wood from these structures will likely accumulate on structures that are downstream. Even structures that are partially lost can create complex habitat and can be maintained during subsequent phases.

Habitat responses are dependent on at least moderate spring flows to redistribute sediments and induce changes to the stream channel.

The recovery of riparian function is dependent upon aggrading the channel and improving floodplain connectivity which takes multiple high flow events.

Scour and pool formation, sediment redistribution, and floodplain connectivity are all dependent upon having sufficiently high flows during runoff for these geomorphic processes to take place.

While this specific issue cannot be addressed directly, direct outcomes of installation that benefit salmonids are increases in cover and velocity refuge.

#7: How have lessons learned from completed projects or monitoring studies informed this project?

Previous restoration on Asotin Creek and other streams in the region (Tumalum Creek, Pataha Creek, Little Tucannon River) and monitoring in the Asotin IMW have shown improvements in habitat conditions for Snake River steelhead and Chinook including instream habitat complexity and sediment sorting.

Lessons learned include:

- Implement project in phases in order to apply adaptive management strategies and repair/add onto existing structures.
- Building in high densities allows structures to work with each other and helps accumulate any lost structures on existing ones.
- Structure complexes should be built with a variety of structure types that have different design purposes (split flows, connect side channels, recruit sediment, collect sediment).
- Structures should be built relatively large and with lower (e.g., Bankfull Elevation) profiles to sustain high flows. Most structures should constrict all or most of the channel to have the most geomorphic effect.

#8: Describe the alternatives considered and why the preferred was chosen.

Low-tech process based restoration was chosen to keep restoration consistent with the IMW study.

#9: How were stakeholders consulted in the development of this project? Identify the stakeholders, their concerns or feedback, and how those concerns were addressed.

We meet with the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board and the Regional Technical Team often to discuss the IMW.

#10: Does your project address or accommodate the anticipated effects of climate change?

Yes

#10a: How will your project be climate resilient given future conditions?

Decreased base flows and higher stream temperatures are imminent in the region due to changes in hydrologic regimes caused by climate change. Side-channel and floodplain connection, the placement of PALS and improvement of riparian function may help mitigate the effects of climate change by reducing water temperature fluctuations, reducing peak flows, and increasing base flows.

## Project Application Report - 23-1036

#10b: How will your project increase habitat and species adaptability?

BDAs and PALS create habitat complexity which fish use at different spatial and temporal scales (Wathen et al. 2018). This habitat heterogeneity provide conditions (i.e., flows, temperature) that allow adaptability for species in a warming climate.

#11: Describe the sponsor's experience managing this type of project. Describe other projects where the sponsor has successfully used a similar approach.

TU has an extensive history managing instream flow, fish passage, habitat restoration projects and several successful years of the managing a BDA and Beaver Project.

#12: Will veterans (including the veterans conservation corps) be involved in the project? If yes, please describe.

No



# Project Application Report - 23-1036

## Restoration Supplemental

#1: What level of design (per Appendix D) have you completed? Please attach.

Conceptual

#1a: What level of design will be produced prior to construction?

Final

#2: Will (or did) a licensed professional engineer design the project?

No

#2a: Describe the qualifications of the design team.

The team will be experienced in all aspects of designing and building low-tech process-based restoration structures (PALS & BDAs). Design experience comes from multiple projects in the region including in the Asotin IMW, Pataha, Alpowa, and Tumalum creeks, and the L. Tucannon River. WDFW will also be consulted and their staff utilized for the design on WDFW property.

#3: Does the project include measures to stabilize an eroding stream bank?

No

#4: Is the primary activity of the project invasive species removal?

No

#5: Is the primary activity of the project riparian planting?

No

#6: Describe the steps you will take to minimize the introduction of invasive species during construction and restoration. Consider how you will use un-infested materials and clean equipment entering and leaving the project area.

The sponsor will use native materials on site or locally sourced to build BDAs and PALS. All equipment used for the project will be cleaned before and after each site visit.

#7: Describe the long-term stewardship and maintenance obligations for the project.

We do not expect any long-term stewardship or maintenance obligations for this project although future funding may be sought for structure enhancement. If additional funds are available after attaining restoration metrics, the Grantee will, if necessary, enhance or repair the structures. However, these structures are designed to be dynamic and work as a group and therefore, only some maintenance should inherently be required. All materials will be biodegradable.

## Restoration Metrics

# Project Application Report - 23-1036

## Worksite: Asotin IMW (#1)

Miles of Stream and/or Shoreline Treated or Protected (C.0.b)	8.
Project Identified In a Plan or Watershed Assessment (C.0.c)	Northwest Marine Fisheries Service. 201 ESA Recovery Plan for Snake Riv Spring/Summer Chinook Salm (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) & Snake Riv Basin Steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) Portland, O
Priority in Recovery Plan	The project is located in a major spawni area for steelhead and a priority restorati reach in the Snake River Salmon Recove Plan and 3 year workpl
Type Of Monitoring (C.0.d.1)	No
Monitoring Location (C.0.d.2)	No monitoring complet

## INSTREAM HABITAT PROJECT

Total Miles Of Instream Habitat Treated (C.4.b)	8.
<b>Channel reconfiguration and connectivity (C.4.c.1)</b>	
Total cost for Channel reconfiguration and connectivity	\$56,4
Type of change to channel configuration and connectivity (C.4.c.2)	Creation/Connection to C Channel Habi
Miles of Stream Treated for channel reconfiguration and connectivity (C.4.c.3)	6.
Miles of Off-Channel Stream Created or Connected (C.4.c.4)	1.
Acres Of Channel/Off-Channel Connected Or Added (C.4.c.5)	7
Instream Pools Created/Added (C.4.c.6)	1.
<b>Channel structure placement (C.4.d.1)</b>	
Total cost for Channel structure placement	\$313,0
Material Used For Channel Structure (C.4.d.2)	Individual Lo (Unanchore Logs Fastened Togeth (Logja Stumps With Roots Attach (Rootwa
Miles of Stream Treated for channel structure placement (C.4.d.3)	5.
Pools Created through channel structure placement (C.4.d.5)	1.
Number of structures placed in channel (C.4.d.7)	4

## CULTURAL RESOURCES

### Cultural resources

Total cost for Cultural resources	\$10,0
Acres surveyed for cultural resources	72.

## PERMITS

### Obtain permits

Total cost to Obtain permits	\$5,0
Number of permits required for implementation of project	

## ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING

### Architectural & Engineering (A&E)

Total cost for Architectural & Engineering (A&E)	\$64,3
--	--------

## AGENCY INDIRECT COSTS

### Agency Indirect

Total cost for Agency Indirect	\$55,2
--------------------------------	--------

Overall Project Metrics

COMPLETION DATE

Projected date of completion	12/31/20
------------------------------	----------

# Project Application Report - 23-1036

## Restoration Cost Estimates

### Worksite #1: Asotin IMW

Category	Work Type	Estimated Cost	Note
Agency Indirect Costs	Agency Indirect	\$55,252	
Cultural Resources	Cultural resources	\$10,000	
Instream Habitat Project	Channel reconfiguration and connectivity (C.4.c.1)	\$56,400	
	Channel structure placement (C.4.d.1)	\$313,000	
Permits	Obtain permits	\$5,000	
	Subtotal:	\$439,652	
Admin, Architecture, and Engineering		\$64,320	
	Total Estimate For Worksite:	\$503,972	

### Summary

Total Estimated Costs Without AA&E:	\$439,652
Total Estimated AA&E:	\$64,320
Total Estimated Restoration Costs:	\$503,972

## Cost Summary

	Estimated Cost	Project %	Admin/AA&E %
<u>Restoration Costs</u>			
Restoration	\$439,652		
Admin, Architecture, and Engineering	\$64,320		16.73 %
SUBTOTAL	\$503,972	100.00 %	
Total Cost Estimate	\$503,972	100.00 %	

## Funding Request and Match

### FUNDING PROGRAM

Salmon State Projects	\$454,472	90.178026 %
-----------------------	-----------	-------------

### SPONSOR MATCH

Other In-Kind Contributions	Donated Equipment	
Amount		\$2,500.
Funding Organization		Private
Other In-Kind Contributions	Donated Materials	
Amount		\$10,000.
Funding Organization		Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFV) USFS; Private
Other In-Kind Contributions	Donated Materials	
Amount		\$10,000.
Funding Organization		US Forest Service Umatilla National Forest (USF)
Other In-Kind Contributions	Donated Services	
Amount		\$10,000.
Funding Organization		Private
Other In-Kind Contributions	Donated Services	
Amount		\$17,000.

# Project Application Report - 23-1036

Funding Organization

Private

Match Total: \$49,5009.821974 %

Total Funding Request (Funding + Match): \$503,972100.000000

## Questions

#1: Explain how you determined the cost estimates

Actual costs, based on projected additional resources and time commitments.

## Cultural Resources

### Cultural Resource Areas

#### Worksite #1: Asotin IMW

##### Area: Charley Creek

- #1: Provide a description of the project actions at this worksite (acquisition, development and/or restoration activities that will occur as a part of this project)
- #2: Describe all ground disturbing activities (length, width and depth of disturbance and equipment utilized) that will take place in the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Include the location of any construction staging or access roads associated with your project that will involve ground disturbance.
- #3: Describe any planned ground disturbing pre-construction/restoration work. This includes geo-technical investigation, fencing, demolition, decommissioning roads, etc.
- #4: Describe the existing project area conditions. The description should include existing conditions, current and historic land uses and previous excavation/fill (if depths and extent is known, please describe).
- #5: Will a federal permit be required to complete the scope of work on the project areas located within this worksite?
- #6: Are you utilizing Federal Funding to complete the scope of work? This includes funds that are being shown as match or not.
- #7: Do you have knowledge of any previous cultural resource review within the project boundaries during the past 10 years?
- #8: Is the worksite located within an existing park, wildlife refuge, natural area preserve, or other recreation or habitat site?
- #9: Are there any structures over 45 years of age within this worksite? This includes structures such as buildings, tidegates, dikes, residential structures, bridges, rail grades, park infrastructure, etc.

##### Area: North Fork Asotin Creek

- #1: Provide a description of the project actions at this worksite (acquisition, development and/or restoration activities that will occur as a part of this project)

## Project Application Report - 23-1036

- #2: Describe all ground disturbing activities (length, width and depth of disturbance and equipment utilized) that will take place in the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Include the location of any construction staging or access roads associated with your project that will involve ground disturbance.
- #3: Describe any planned ground disturbing pre-construction/restoration work. This includes geo-technical investigation, fencing, demolition, decommissioning roads, etc.
- #4: Describe the existing project area conditions. The description should include existing conditions, current and historic land uses and previous excavation/fill (if depths and extent is known, please describe).
- #5: Will a federal permit be required to complete the scope of work on the project areas located within this worksite?
- #6: Are you utilizing Federal Funding to complete the scope of work? This includes funds that are being shown as match or not.
- #7: Do you have knowledge of any previous cultural resource review within the project boundaries during the past 10 years?
- #8: Is the worksite located within an existing park, wildlife refuge, natural area preserve, or other recreation or habitat site?
- #9: Are there any structures over 45 years of age within this worksite? This includes structures such as buildings, tidegates, dikes, residential structures, bridges, rail grades, park infrastructure, etc.

### Area: South Fork Asotin Creek

- #1: Provide a description of the project actions at this worksite (acquisition, development and/or restoration activities that will occur as a part of this project)
- #2: Describe all ground disturbing activities (length, width and depth of disturbance and equipment utilized) that will take place in the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Include the location of any construction staging or access roads associated with your project that will involve ground disturbance.
- #3: Describe any planned ground disturbing pre-construction/restoration work. This includes geo-technical investigation, fencing, demolition, decommissioning roads, etc.
- #4: Describe the existing project area conditions. The description should include existing conditions, current and historic land uses and previous excavation/fill (if depths and extent is known, please describe).
- #5: Will a federal permit be required to complete the scope of work on the project areas located within this worksite?
- #6: Are you utilizing Federal Funding to complete the scope of work? This includes funds that are being shown as match or not.
- #7: Do you have knowledge of any previous cultural resource review within the project boundaries during the past 10 years?

## Project Application Report - 23-1036

#8: Is the worksite located within an existing park, wildlife refuge, natural area preserve, or other recreation or habitat site?

#9: Are there any structures over 45 years of age within this worksite? This includes structures such as buildings, tidegates, dikes, residential structures, bridges, rail grades, park infrastructure, etc.

### Project Permits

Permits and Reviews	Issuing Organization	Applied Date	Received Date	Expiration Date	Permit #
Cultural Assessment [Section 106]	DAHP				
Endangered Species Act Compliance [ESA]	US Fish & Wildlife				
Hydraulics Project Approval [HPA]	Dept of Fish & Wildlife				
US Army Corps of Engineers					

### Permit Questions

#1: Are you planning on using the federal permit streamlining process? **Limit 8**

No

Attachments

Required Attachments	6 out of 6 done
Applicant Resolution/Authorizations	✓
Cost Estimate	✓
Landowner acknowledgement form	✓
Map: Restoration Worksite	✓
Photo	✓
RCO Fiscal Data Collection Sheet	✓























PHOTOS (JPG, GIF)  
Photos (JPG, GIF)



PROJECT DOCUMENTS AND PHOTOS  
Project Documents and Photos



## Project Application Report - 23-1036

File Type	Attach Date	Attachment Type	Title	Person	File Name, Number Associations	Sh:
	04/14/2023	Map: Restoration Worksite	AsotinIMWRestorationWorkSiteMap.jpeg	StephenB	AsotinIMWRestorationWorkSiteMap.jpeg, 558214	✓
	04/14/2023	Visuals	VicinityMap.jpeg	StephenB	VicinityMap.jpeg, 558206	✓
	04/14/2023	Map: Area of Potential Effect (APE)	AsotinIMWRestoration_APE_Map.jpeg	StephenB	AsotinIMWRestoration_APE_Map.jpeg, 558205	✓
	04/14/2023	Cost Estimate	FINAL_AsotinIMW_CostEstimate_2023.xlsx	StephenB	FINAL_AsotinIMW_CostEstimate_2023... 558203	✓
	04/14/2023	Preliminary design report	Basis_Of_Design_Report_AsotinIMW_Rest	StephenB	Basis_Of_Design_Report_AsotinIMW_... 558175	✓
	04/12/2023	Agreement attachment	FY24 TU Indirect Cost Rate Agreement.pdf	AaronP	FY24 TU Indirect Cost Rate Agreement.pdf, 557903	✓
	04/03/2023	Letters of Support	IMW Certification Memo 23-1036.pdf	StephenB	IMW Certification Memo 23-1036.pdf, 556651	✓
	03/08/2023	Applicant Resolution/Authorizations	ApplicantAuthorizationResolution_2023.doc	AaronP	ApplicantAuthorizationResolution_2023... 554070	✓
	03/08/2023	RCO Fiscal Data Collection Sheet	SRFB FiscalDataCollectionSheet..pdf.PDF.pdf	AaronP	SRFB FiscalDataCollectionSheet..pdf.PDF.pdf, 554020	✓
	02/28/2023	Landowner acknowledgement form	SAL-LandownerAckForm_AsotinCreek_Low-Tech_Restoration&Beaver	StephenB	SAL-LandownerAckForm_AsotinCreek_Low-Tech_Restoration&BeaverRelocation.pdf, 553340	✓
	02/07/2023	Photo	Fig4c_Connecting_Side-channel_NF_Post.jpg	StephenB	Fig4c_Connecting_Side-channel_NF_Post.jpg, 551068	✓
	02/07/2023	Photo	Fig4b_Connecting_Side-channel_NF_Pre.jpg	StephenB	Fig4b_Connecting_Side-channel_NF_Pre.jpg, 551067	✓
	02/07/2023	Photo	Fig4a_Disconnected_Side-channels_NF.jpg	StephenB	Fig4a_Disconnected_Side-channels_NF.jpg, 551066	✓
	02/07/2023	Photo	Fig4a_Connecting_Side-channel_NF_Pre.jpg	StephenB	Fig4a_Connecting_Side-channel_NF_Pre.jpg, 551065	✓
	02/06/2023	Photo	Fig1_Charley_Creek_Berm_OnRiverLeft.JPG	StephenB	Fig1_Charley_Creek_Berm_OnRiverLe... 550929	✓
	02/06/2023	Photo	Fig2_North_Fork_BermOnRiverLeft.JPG	StephenB	Fig2_North_Fork_BermOnRiverLeft.jpg, 550928	✓
	02/06/2023	Photo	Fig3_South_Fork_BermOnRiverLeft.JPG	StephenB	Fig3_South_Fork_BermOnRiverLeft.jpg, 550927	✓
	02/06/2023	Photo	Fig4d_New_Side-channel_NF.JPG	StephenB	Fig4d_New_Side-channel_NF.jpg, 550926	✓
	01/12/2023	Project Review Comments	Project Review Comments Report, 23-1036R (01/12/23 08:38:27)	BartL	Project Review Comments Report - 23-1036 (01-12-2023_08-38-27).pdf, 547790	✓
	01/12/2023	Project Application Report	Project Application Report, 23-1036R (01/12/23 08:38:27)	BartL	Project Application Report - 23-1036 (01-12-2023_08-38-27).pdf, 547789	✓
	01/12/2023	Project Review Comments	Project Review Comments Report, 23-1036C (01/12/23 08:37:47)	BartL	Project Review Comments Report - 23-1036 (01-12-2023_08-37-47).pdf, 547788	✓
	01/12/2023	Project Application Report	Project Application Report, 23-1036C (01/12/23 08:37:46)	BartL	Project Application Report - 23-1036 (01-12-2023_08-37-46).pdf, 547787	✓

## Application Status

Application Due Date: 06/27/2023

Status Name	Status Date	Submitted By	Submission Notes
Application Submitted	04/14/2023	Aaron Penvose	Thanks for the opportunity and considerations.
Preapplication	01/09/2023		

I certify that to the best of my knowledge, the information in this application is true and correct. Further, all application requirements due on the application due date have been fully completed to the best of my ability. I understand that if this application is found to be incomplete, it will be rejected by RCO. I understand that I may be required to submit additional documents before evaluation or approval of this project and I agree to provide them. (Aaron Penvose, 04/14/2023)

# Project Application Report - 23-1036

Date of last change: 04/14/2023